

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

\* \* \*

U.S. BANK, N.A., et al.,

Case No. 2:17-CV-2166 JCM (CWH)

**Plaintiff(s),**

## ORDER

V.

MARTIN CENTENO, et al.,

**Defendant(s).**

Presently before the court is defendant Ricardo Fojas' motion for extension of time to file a response to plaintiff's motion for reconsideration (ECF No. 36). (ECF No. 39).

Defendant's motion requests a twenty (20) day extension to file a response to plaintiff's motion for reconsideration (ECF No. 36). (ECF No. 39). The current response deadline was set for July 27, 2018. *Id.* On that same day defendant filed his motion to extend.

Defendant requests an extension because he claims to have only learned about the motion for reconsideration on July 26, the day before his response was due. (ECF No. 39). The court will grant defendant's motion as an extension will further the judicial purpose of ensuring that the motion is decided on the merits. *See Ahanchian v. Xenon Pictures, Inc.*, 624 F.3d 1253, 1258–59 (9th Cir. 2010). However, twenty (20) days, in addition to the fourteen (14) that defendant already had, would gratuitously delay litigation. Thus, the court will grant defendant only seven (7) additional days to file his response.

1

Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that defendant's motion for extension of time (ECF No. 39) be, and the same hereby is, GRANTED. Defendant will have an additional seven days from the date of this order to file a response to plaintiff's motion for reconsideration (ECF No. 36).

DATED August 3, 2018.

James C. Mahan  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE